

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SOUTH CAROLINA WILDLIFE FEDERATION NAMES WATER CONSERVATIONIST OF THE YEAR

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 14, 1971

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, according to an article published in a recent copy of the Water Spectrum magazine, the South Carolina Wildlife Federation has cited Col. Burke W. Lee as water conservationist of the year for his attempts to "combine needed development and progress with a high regard for our national resources." Colonel Lee is the Charleston district engineer for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

I feel that this award is not only well-deserved recognition of a conscientious conservationist, but also recognition of State and Federal teamwork in the area of conservation. Colonel Lee has worked closely with the South Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission as well as other State agencies to develop the planning and management needed to bring about sensible, healthy development of the water resources of South Carolina.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the excerpt from the Charleston Evening Post, which was reprinted in the spring issue of the magazine Water Spectrum, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH CAROLINA WILDLIFE FEDERATION NAMES WATER CONSERVATIONIST OF THE YEAR

When the South Carolina Wildlife Federation this month named Col. Burke W. Lee its water conservationist of the year it was the first time conservationists in this State had smiled with favor on the Army Engineers.

It marked recognition of the Corps of Engineers' protective policy towards the Nation's waters during the last few years.

Lee is Charleston District Engineer. The agency of the Federal government has not been exactly the darling of the "hard line" protectionists among wildlife and nature buffs. What brought about the award was a change in emphasis in Washington, D.C., a change that began in earnest with passage of the 1969 National Environmental Policy Act.

Basically, that act is a matter of interpretation of what may and may not be done by the government in its efforts to control, reduce and—perhaps—stop the increase in pollution of land, air and water.

As Lee put it: "The action and events resulting in the award have been the result of the policy of the Corps of Engineers in its growing response to the need to protect the quality of our environment. The Corps has always tried to reflect the public will. Ten or 20 years ago, the public was not as concerned over environmental protection as it is today."

Lee said that the award was "really an award to this district, not to me. It came as a result of the hard work and dedication of our entire staff of military and civilian personnel."

Even so, the Wildlife Federation's presentation to Lee marks one of the few times in

the Nation that an Army Engineer District head has so been honored.

When President Nixon directed a hard-nosed approach to environmental care two years ago, the Corps of Engineers was rather definitely in bad odor with the wildlife and outdoors people. Under the new policies, these same people today are looking to the Corps for leadership in many facets of the quality environmental thrust.

Among the items listed in the Wildlife Federation's citation on Lee were his handling of a major oil spill in Charleston Harbor, the halting of unauthorized landfill operations and development of sophisticated diking systems for impounding dredge spoil.

The citation also commended Lee's attempts to "combine needed development and progress with a high regard for our natural resources."

Since becoming district engineer, Lee has accomplished a memorandum of understanding between the engineers and the South Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission providing for multiple use of selected disposal areas. This program is designed to permit development of the areas for fish and wildlife as well as for disposal of dredged spoil.

Under the terms of the Rivers and Harbors Act, the State must supply all disposal areas. The South Carolina State Ports Authority acts for the State insofar as waterways are concerned. Thus, the engineers' dredges may not dump dredge spoil anywhere unless the area has been selected, approved and provided by the State.

One of Lee's projects has been a long range spoil disposal study. It takes into consideration 10 different plans for disposal of dredge silt, each with its own analysis of its effect on wildlife. Another project has been on beach erosion, an area in which Lee has arranged meetings between Federal and State leaders where studies were made of how other States met the problem and legislative suggestions made.

During the year, Lee appeared more than 30 times before civic clubs, college groups and State and Federal agencies. One of his tenets is that "sensible, healthy development of the water resources of South Carolina cannot take place without good planning and management."

The Wildlife Federation judges took into consideration that bit of reasoning and the fact that Lee has been wholeheartedly behind such efforts.

As one observer of the environmental and ecological revolution put it: "The idealists have fought the engineers for many years. Now, with the two groups pulling in the same direction for once, there simply isn't any limit to what can be accomplished."

Whatever happens, Col. Burke W. Lee, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the district he commands, can head on into the continuing battle for clean waters with the satisfaction of a job well done last year.

TAX FREE FOUNDATIONS LOBBY ILLEGALLY FOR SOCIALISM, SUBVERSION, AND COMMUNISM

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in an interesting and illuminating article entitled "The Invisible Empire," columnist

Kevin P. Phillips spotlights an inequitable situation which cries for reform. I am referring to the preferred status which certain tax exempt foundations continue to enjoy even though they continue to violate section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code which states the qualifications for tax exemption of an organization as follows:

(3) Corporations, and any community chest, fund or foundation, organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, testing for public safety, literary or educational purposes, or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual, no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence legislation, and which does not participate in, or intervene in (including the publishing or distributing of statements), any political campaign on behalf of any candidate for public office.

The code further provides that an organization will be regarded as trying to influence legislation if it:

(a) Contacts, or urges the public to contact, members of the legislative body for the purpose of proposing, supporting or opposing legislation; or

(b) Advocates the adoption or rejecting of legislation.

It logically follows that an organization engaged in political activity will not be granted a tax exempt status and that an organization already enjoying such a status should forfeit it if the organization should engage in political activities. The fact is as pointed out by Mr. Phillips, that many tax exempt organizations have been for a long time violating the law without suffering any penalty or loss of their tax exemption.

Two special congressional committees—the Cox Committee in 1952 and the Reece Committee in the 83d Congress—exposed the misuse of resources by tax exempt foundations for un-American and subversive activities. Apparently no action has been taken by the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service nor by the Congress to correct this situation.

While tax free foundations perform appropriate functions as prescribed by law, many of them have abused their privilege by engaging in such matters as paying honorariums to leftist speakers on campuses, awarding a \$640,000 grant to the Marxist oriented National Student Association, awarding a grant of \$350,000 to the licentious SIECUS organization which condones and promotes immorality, granting \$630,000 to the Southwest Council of La Raza Unida headed by a man cited as a Communist Party member by the Subversive Activity Control Board, and so forth.

It is unjust that small businessmen, factory workers, farmers, and other hardworking taxpayers—who produce in the free market economy to build America—must pay taxes while some tax exempt foundation, which accumulated its wealth through the free enterprise sys-

tem, should escape paying even its fair share of taxes while promoting socialism and communism—the antithesis of free enterprise.

I insert Mr. Phillips' article, along with other pertinent articles:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 3, 1971]

THE INVISIBLE EMPIRE

(By Kevin P. Phillips)

New economic information suggests that an invisible empire of wealth and privilege is quietly taking shape across America; the increasingly rich and politically active network of U.S. "charitable" and other tax-exempt organizations.

Research into the assets and activities of organizations gathered behind the shield of federal tax exemption yields a startling portrait of little-recognized financial and political power. Among this survey's findings:

Between 1950 and 1971, the number of U.S. foundations increased from 1,000 to 25,000, while total assets climbed from \$2.5 billion to approximately \$20 billion.

U.S. churches are using their multi-billion dollar shareholdings in American business to seek to compel changes in corporate policies ranging from investment in South Africa to environmental practices.

Contrary to the spirit—and sometimes the letter—of U.S. tax laws, the churches, foundations and universities have been attempting to influence legislation.

Charitable foundations. Since 1950, foundations have multiplied and prospered, climbing from \$2.5 billion in assets to a massive \$20 billion. Of all tax-exempt organizations, these are probably the most controversial. (Unlike the others, they pay a token 4 percent excise tax on income.) All together, U.S. foundations spend some \$1.5 billion a year in pursuit of their varying objectives.

The Ford Foundation, with \$3 billion in assets, is the biggest and most venturesome. Housed in a \$20 million crystal palace in midtown Manhattan with lush private camellia and azalea gardens, Ford functionaries dispense some \$200-\$300 million a year.

They have financed such political causes as traveling grants for the staff of the late U.S. Senator Robert Kennedy, voter registration drives in black (but not white) sections of Cleveland, and the sustenance of the chicano socio-political movement, La Raza.

In recent years, U.S. charitable foundations have devoted about \$300 million a year to poverty-group and minority programming. Comparatively little money is spent on behalf of rural or small town America, blue-collar workers or white . . .

Federal legislation passed in 1969 bars the use of foundation money to "attempt to influence any legislation through an attempt to affect the opinion of the general public or any segment thereof." So far, this prohibition has not been seriously enforced, and many foundations are trying to shape the direction of governmental policies and priorities.

UNIVERSITIES

The nation's colleges and universities are another repository of growing tax-exempt financial power. Their collective endowments total about \$10 billion. Harvard and other rich universities hold large chunks of corporate stock, which campus activists would like to see used to influence the management decisions of American business.

At Harvard, a committee on university relations with corporate enterprise has just filed a report which says that Harvard's investments should aim at income production rather than social goals.

But other large universities are still considering joining in tax-exempt organization campaigns to police the conduct of business corporations.

Like foundations, colleges have begun to delve into politics. Section 501 (c) (3) of the federal tax code states that tax-exempt institutions must not "participate in, or otherwise intervene in . . . any political campaign on behalf of any candidate for public office."

CHURCHES

Detailed information is not available regarding the tax-exempt wealth of U.S. religious denominations, though it is large and growing.

U.S. churches now own more than \$6 billion worth of stock in U.S. corporations. Seven major Protestant denominations, recently banded together for social application of their corporate power, account for \$4 billion of this.

Frank P. White, director of Resource Studies for the National Council of Churches, has announced a policy whereby churches will use their shareholdings to influence corporate policies in the fields of minority hiring, pollution, consumerism, military production and foreign investment.

In a more overtly political vein, a group of U.S. religious organizations has joined together to push for Congressional adoption of legislation to withdraw American troops from Indochina by Dec. 31, 1971.

[Newsletter]

COUNT DOWN—FAITH, FACTS AND FREEDOM TAX-FREE DOLLARS FOR DESTRUCTION

Part I.—Tax-Exemption Code

Section 501(c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code states the qualifications for tax-exemption of an organization as follows:

"(3) Corporations, and any community chest, fund or foundation, organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, testing for public safety, literary or educational purposes, or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual, no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence legislation, and which does not participate in, or intervene in (including the publishing or distributing of statements), and political campaign on behalf of any candidate for public office."

The code also states that an organization will be regarded as attempting to influence legislation if it:

"(a) Contacts, or urges the public to contact, members of the legislative body for the purpose of proposing, supporting or opposing legislation; or

"(b) Advocates the adoption or rejecting of legislation."

In other words, any group engaged in political activity will not be allowed tax-exemption and one already granted tax-exemption cannot engage in or subsidize political action without forfeiting its tax-free status. But this code is being violated by tax-exempt organizations without suffering any penalty or cancellation of its tax-exemption.

Our nation is beset by anti-American activities of both violence and subtle subversion for the destruction of our Republic. Such action is political and, therefore, financial support of these destructive activities is also political.

Both destructive and constructive programs or forces require funds. The destructive forces in our nation receive money from: private funds (uninformed, misled individuals and corporations); government giveaways (such as agencies of the OEO); college subsidies (honorariums paid Old Left and New Left speakers on campuses, and salaries paid socialist and/or pro-communist teachers); church funds (donations of church members, especially of churches in the National Council of Churches), and tax-exempt organizations and foundations.

Funds from tax-free foundations have been destructive in two main areas: 1) the

foundations have been nesting places of Keynesism, the State-Socialist economic theory of deficit spending which permeates our college curricula and our government, and 2) foundations grants to radical, anti-American groups and individuals whose stated goal is overthrow of our American fundamentals.

Power of foundations

Foundation funds are essentially tax dollars because the dollars which sustain foundations would otherwise go directly to the Federal in the form of taxes. Our inheritance tax laws are largely responsible for setting up the conditions creating a need for tax-free foundations. Foundations enable the wealthy to keep their fortunes intact and avoid the taxes they would otherwise have to pay. Some families have more than one Foundation, e.g.: the Ford family has seven foundations; the Carnegies five; the Mellons six; the Rockefellers fourteen, and the exact number of the Kennedy family is not known. LBJ's foundation, the Johnson City Foundation, was set up by Lyndon and Lady Bird in 1956. There is even a Playboy Foundation which affords Hugh Hefner tax-free dollars.

The power of foundations is enormous and their number increases each year. The UPI, July 19, 1969, reported the income of the largest 596 foundations is more than twice the net earnings of the nation's fifty largest commercial banks. The total listed assets of only those foundations filed with the federal government exceed \$18 billion, with most of them in New York.

Foundations can buy, sell or hold real estate and securities, and can make loans at low interest rates to the donor and his relatives to run the foundation, providing them both salaries and fringe benefits.

While millions of taxpayers wrestle with their income tax returns, the thousands of tax-exempt foundations are apparently under no official pressure to submit their reports, even though the statute under which they operate requires an accounting. The penalties for disregarding income reports are the same for foundations as for individuals—fines up to \$10,000 and jail terms. The big difference, however, is that the Internal Revenue Service has every taxpayer numbered, tabulated and computerized but there is no such tabulation on foundations. At times these foundations have been under-fire by concerned Congressmen but no comprehensive investigation has been possible because the IRS has no knowledge of their number, identity or financial maneuverings—the Secretary of the Treasury has admitted this. And the Treasury Department has not held the foundations accountable for their operations even though their illegal financing of political activities has become public knowledge.

An investigation

From Nov. 1, 1953 to April 30, 1964, a special U.S. House Committee, headed by Cong. Carroll Reece (R-Tenn.), conducted an investigation of tax-exempt foundations. A report of this probe is known as *The Dodd Report*, submitted by Norman Dodd, Director of Research for the committee. At that time it was estimated there were over 6,000 foundations with capital resources amounting to \$7,500,000,000 and disbursements in the form of grants which amounted to over \$300,000,000 annually for the years from 1903 to 1953.

According to the committee, foundations identified their grants as "education", "charitable", "welfare", "religious", "scientific", "for the good of humanity" and "for the benefit of mankind"—given to advance "peace", "international accord" and "international understanding".

Faced with a probe of such magnitude, the Reece Committee tried to find a factor common to all. The single factor was found to be "public interest", advanced not only through their grants to educational insti-

tutions but through cooperation with the policies our Federal Government had followed since 1903.

The Committee found that foundation grants were directly related to federal policies of: an international viewpoint, a decrease of safeguards for American traditions, changing school and college curricula away from the concepts of Americanism and pressing education into service of a political nature. As a result, the committee turned its investigation toward those receiving grants and found that they all "encouraged humanist studies regarded as social sciences"; "had monopolistic aims"; "spread socialism by peaceful means"; "held radical ideas"; "fostered some form of collectivism" and "an increase in the authority of the State", and were "a stimulus to empirical thinking".

The Reece Committee's general conclusions were: 1) a close cooperation exists between privately owned foundations, agencies through which they operate and the educational institutions benefiting from the grants, resulting in "an undesirable degree of concentrated power"; 2) the operation of "social engineering" is a policy common to all Foundations and our Federal Government; 3) far too many foundation grants are made "to finance ideas and practices incompatible with the fundamental concepts of our Constitution"; and 4) further investigation of the Ford Foundation seems necessary because, without precedent as to size, this Foundation is dedicated to "problem solving on a world scale".

The foundations contacted by the Reece Committee—especially the Ford Foundation—not only gave little cooperation but even hampered the investigation. The late Rowan Gaither, head of the Ford Foundation at that time, made the following statement to the Committee's Director of Research, which seems to reveal the real purpose for foundation grants:

"We who are working for the Foundations formerly worked for the State Department, the Marshall Plan or the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. In those days, we were working under instructions from the White House to bring about such sociological, economic and political changes as would make union with Russia easy and comfortable for the American people. Now, in the Foundations, we are working toward that same goal." (Count Down says: What could be plainer?)

Ford Foundation grants

The Ford Foundation was started by Henry Ford, Sr. with grant of his own Ford Motor Co. stock worth \$500 million. This original sum has now grown to almost \$4 billion. The foundation still owns 30 million shares of Ford Motor Co. stock. The annual income of the Ford Foundation exceeds that of the world's biggest banking institution.

The Great Tax Fraud, by Dr. Martin Larson, states that by creating the Ford Foundation at least \$1.6 billion in estate taxes have been avoided during the last 20 years. Dr. Larson writes: "The creation of the Ford Foundation has already cost the federal Treasury something like \$8 or \$10 billion."

The following is but a sample of grants made by the Ford Foundation to anti-American and/or Socialist forces engaged in political activism:

\$15 million to the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions at Santa Barbara, California, which serves as a "psychological warfare center" for distribution of New Left and Socialist materials, whose staff members have included known Communists.

\$640,000 to the Marxist-oriented National Students Association (NSA) whose president admitted NSA "is in a massive drive to unite militants on the campuses."

\$50,000, indirectly, to playwright LeRoi Jones of the Black Repertory Theatre in Harlem which produces pornographic, hate-

whitey plays. Jones was arrested for leading riots in Newark, N.J. in 1967 and the N.Y. police discovered an arsenal of weapons which had been concealed in Jones' theatre.

\$350,000 to Sex Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS) whose "sex education courses" condone immorality, and whose staff of officers have included persons associated with communist-fronts and publication of pornography.

\$131,000 for travel and study grants to eight former aides of the late Senator Robert Kennedy.

\$6 million to National Education Television, regarded by many to be socialist and/or leftist slanted.

\$1.25 million to the Citizens Crusade Against Poverty, part of the political activist "Coalition" formed in 1965, whose chairman was Walter Reuther, and vice-chairmen were Dr. Eugene Carson Blake and Martin Luther King, formed to lobby and demonstrate for recognition of Red China, federal aid to education, civil rights and war-on-poverty laws.

\$100 million to Public Broadcasting, largely under left-of-liberal control.

\$1 million to the London School of Economics, a Socialist-Marxist oriented college established many years ago in England by the Fabian Socialists.

\$250,000 to the National Committee on United States-China, which promotes the recognition of Red China.

\$60,000 to the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith for printing of "civil rights" pamphlets.

\$4.5 million to the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), sometimes called the "Invisible Government" or "Secret Government" of the U.S., whose members control much of our nation's policies, federal appointees and national political candidates and fosters One World Government at sacrifice of our country's sovereignty.

\$1,630,000 to the Rand Corp., a cybernetic left-of-liberal "Think Tank" which does research for the government, business and the Foundations themselves.

\$77,000 to a demonstration at the Ocean Hill-Brownsville District which became so violent that the schools in the district were forced to close.

\$150,000 to the Pacifica Foundation for funding its four far-out-left radio stations whose regular guests are radical revolutionaries.

\$100,000 to the League of Women Voters for its Voter Education Fund.

\$430,000 to the Urban League whose chief, Whitney M. Young, came out in favor of "Black Power" and in opposition to non-violence.

\$400,000 to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), to be used at its own discretion. \$149,000 to the Citizens Research Foundation for "research in campaign financing" which ended up being used for Negro Voting Registration in Cleveland.

\$45,000, and later \$76,000 more, to the A. Philip Randolph Institute to train Negroes as apprentices in breaking down craft union discrimination.

\$175,000 and later \$300,000 more to the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), a militant group who used much of the fund for election of Negro Carl Stokes as Mayor of Cleveland.

\$130,000 to the Greater Washington Educational Television Association, owner of radio-TV station WETA, whose programs specialize in smear of patriotic persons and groups. Its chairman, Max Kampelman, chief fund-raiser for Hubert Humphrey's presidential campaign, was investigated by the General Accounting Office.

\$230,000 to Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference to be used for leadership training of 10 black ministers in 15 cities—teaching them how to get federal and state funds for use in "ghetto projects".

\$5 million to the Urban Affairs Foundation which, as reported by the American Conservative Union to the House Ways and Means Committee, was to be used for the increase of the number of Negro members of the U.S. Congress from 9 to 30. (The American Conservative Union, of course, does not enjoy tax-exempt status.)

\$163,000 to the American Community Programs Foundation; \$575,300 to the National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice; \$300,000 to the Inner City Cultural Center, and \$50,000 to the Constitutional Rights Foundation—all revolutionary groups whose grants were reported in April 1970 to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee by Sgt. Robert J. Thoms of the Los Angeles Police Department.

\$125,000 to pay the expenses of any U.S. scholars Castro might choose to come to Cuba to do "research" for promoting knowledge about "contemporary Cuba".

\$630,000 to the Southwest Council of La Raza Unida, headed by Maclovio R. Barraza who was cited as a Communist Party member by our Subversive Activities Control Board, and later an additional \$545,717 to La Raza, which Rep. Henry Gonzalez describes as an organization for fomenting "simple, blind, stupid hatred".

\$13,130 to finance writing and publishing of Huey P. Newton's autobiography—given to J. Herman Blake, a Negro sociology teacher at the Univ. of California at Santa Cruz who is collaborating on the book. Newton was convicted of manslaughter in 1968 for killing a policeman and is out on \$50,000 bail posted by the Black Panther Party and its lawyer, Charles Garry.

\$200,000 to UNESCO, the power arm of the United Nations for dealing with educational, scientific and cultural affairs slanted toward One World Government.

\$234,083,307 to Foreign Aid, which includes grants to pro-communist nations.

\$44 million to programs of the Behavioral Sciences, the brainwashing programs known as "Sensitivity Training".

\$275,000 to the Committee of Economic Development (CED), which created the Commission on Money and Credit in 1957 and is a propaganda arm of the Council on Foreign Relations for socializing the American economy.

\$1 million to the American Friends Service Committee which works openly with the Vietcong, sponsored the communist-front "World Youth Conference" and sent delegates to youth conferences behind the Iron Curtain.

\$75,000 to the Humanistic and Educational Needs of the Academic Community (HENAC), and experimental course set up at UCLA by the Community for American and Social Education (CASE). HENAC holds seminars on racism, "repression by the police," economic boycotts and working-class issues; prints and circulates revolutionary tracts; supports the ideas of Mao, Lenin, Marx, Engels, Castro, Trotsky, Malcolm X, W. E. B. DuBois, Eldridge Cleaver, Abbie Hoffman and Jerry Rubin. HENAC furnished the planning, personnel and money for the Feb. 19, 1970 riots in Los Angeles when the Bank of America was bombed, and the HENAC office doubles for the Black Panther Information Center.

\$225,000 given to Cesar Chavez recently. Chavez is the radical labor leader sent to jail for defying a court order. This grant goes to the National Farmworkers Service Centers established by Chavez in California, Arizona and Texas as "shock troops" for his grape boycott and lettuce strike.

In his testimony, April 1970, to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, Sgt. Robert J. Thoms said revolutionary groups in California were financed by: various churches, the federal government and the Ford Foundation. Funds are usually given to "umbrella" organizations which distribute the

money. Churches have contributed a total of \$202,500, the Ford Foundation \$1,088,300 and \$4,818,170 from federal programs. The Episcopal Church gave \$43,000 to the Afro-Mexican Proposal and \$40,000 to Alianza; First Unitarian Church \$2,000 to the Black Panther Party; and the Los Angeles Brotherhood Crusade received \$2,500 from the United Church of Christ; \$105,000 from the United Methodist Church, and \$10,000 from the Inter-religious Foundation for Community Organization (IFCO) which, by the 1970 report of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, also furnishes money to the Black Panthers, Socialists and Communists.

The Fund for the Republic, an off-shoot of the Ford Foundation, was created in 1952. It is noted for its vicious attacks on the internal security programs of our nation and its opposition to the FBI and all governmental committees which investigate Communism. W. H. Ferry, a vice-president of the Fund for the Republic, in a speech in Seattle, August 6, 1962, called the FBI's fight against Communism "ineffective spy swatting".

Ford Foundation and genocide

Through its "Population Council", the Ford Foundation has spent \$100 million since 1952 on research in control of population. It has spent more than our Federal Government on population control programs and brags about its influence in interesting our government in this.

Ford Foundation employees have produced more than 700 scientific papers on control over fertility and established research centers at universities across our country which are known as: "Health and Family Planning", "Population Research and Training Center", "Community and Family Study Center", "Planned Parenthood", "Population Planning", "World Population Organization" and "Economic Planning Unit". In the first eight months of the Foundation's "Center for Population Planning" at the University of Michigan, 20,000 young women began taking the anti-fertility pill.

The Foundation's Population Council has developed all kinds of devices, pills and injections for sterilization of both males and females. Its population planning has been extended to 26 other countries and its stated goal is to reduce India's birth rate from 40 per thousand to 25 per thousand "as expeditiously as possible".

Many of these population control programs include sensitivity training and sex education courses, both of which have contributed to today's problem of sexual promiscuity. It would seem, therefore, that the Ford Foundation not only tries to solve problems but creates the problems to solve and, in addition, promotes the government's spending of tax dollars on both the creation of problems and solution of them.

The Genocide Treaty, Article II, Section (d) defines "measures to prevent births within a group" as an act of genocide. Through its Population Council and research centers for the prevention of births, isn't the Ford Foundation guilty of genocide? If our government ratifies this heinous Genocide Convention, couldn't the Ford Foundation be charged (as the treaty states) with "complicity" and a "direct and public incitement" of genocide?

Family planning should be *only* the responsibility of individual families, *not* the responsibility of Government or tax-exempt Foundations!

F.O.R.D.

Of the many demands for a thorough investigation of foundations, particularly the Ford Foundation, none has been so vociferous as an organization called Families Opposing Revolutionary Donations (F.O.R.D.), headed by Hurst B. Amyx. (For information about this organization, contact: F.O.R.D., Taft Bldg., Hollywood & Vine, Hollywood, California 90028)

F.O.R.D. is circulating petitions to get 10 million signatures of Americans who will not buy Ford products until Ford dollars cease the support of anti-Americanism. Ford dealers and salesmen are becoming increasingly alarmed about the \$300 million granted annually by the Ford Foundation to pro-Communist activities in our nation.

F.O.R.D. has been so successful in exposing the Foundation's financing of anti-American political activity that Mr. Allen Merrill, Ford Foundation executive, made a special trip to California in April 1970 to interview Mr. Amyx. Mr. Merrill admitted the Foundation was the largest single stockholder of Ford Motor Co. stock and thus benefited enormously from the sale of Ford, Mercury and Lincoln cars. In his concern over the successful efforts of F.O.R.D., Mr. Merrill proposed appointment of knowledgeable pro-Americans to administer the funds of the present Foundation—or a new Foundation—who would channel grants only to patriotic groups and individuals. To date, however, there has been no indication of this change in policy of the Ford Foundation.

Political activity by tax-exempt organizations violates the very law which grants them tax-free status, thus their tax-exemption should forthwith be denied.

Monetary grants to radical anti-American forces means increasing attacks on the lives and property of loyal Americans, weakening our national economy, destroying our educational institutions and, in general, advancing Socialism in the U.S. The financing of these destructive forces makes them prosper—it is treason. But why aren't the revolutionaries and their supporters identified and punished for this treason? Sir John Harrison answered this question over 300 years ago, when he said:

"For if it (treason) prosper, none dare call it treason."

[From the Houston (Tex.) Tribune,
Nov. 28, 1968]

FORD FOUNDATION, POLITICS

(By Alice Widener)

NEW YORK CITY.—Charges and counter-charges are profuse in the New York City teachers' strike that kept a million public school children out of classrooms all fall. Basically, Ford Foundation money is at the root of the entire affair, for "FF" dreamed up the original idea for decentralization of the N.Y. City public school system which has resulted in an ugly hassle over community control.

McGeorge Bundy, president of the Ford Foundation, bitterly denies charges against it by Albert Shanker, president of the striking teachers' union. "If private foundations cannot assist experiments" says Mr. Bundy, "their unique role will be impaired, to the detriment of American society."

SPLIT PERSONALITY

That is a most sweeping statement. Many foundations have done marvelous work in financing experiments of value to our society; others have financed experiments that have been detrimental to it. The Ford Foundation always has had a kind of split personality, ever since it began operations in a big way during the early 1950's. Some of its activities have been admirable; others not so praiseworthy.

Albert Shanker says that the Ford Foundation "is investing heavily in every major organization that has influence over the educational policies of the city. That fact should cause concern for all of us. Why are they doing it? They are doing it to influence the educational policies of the city."

Mr. Shanker has a strong point which the FF seeks to blunt. For if it were to admit openly its efforts to mold city policy, that effort could be called "political" and therefore not permissible for a tax-exempt foundation. His question "why are they doing

it?" ought to be asked of the Ford Foundation about several of its operations, some of them of such a nature that many concerned citizens believe there ought to be a New York State or federal investigation of the Ford Foundation.

NOT VERY CREDIBLE

Its disavowal of political activity is understandable but not very credible when one reads the Ford Foundation press release of Friday, November 8, 1968, which announces contribution of "travel and study grants totaling \$131,069 for eight members of the staff of the late Sen. Robert F. Kennedy . . . Jerry Bruno, Joseph Dolan, Peter Edelman, Dall Forsythe, Earl Graves, Thomas Johnston, Frank Mankiewicz and Adam Walinsky." Simple arithmetic shows that each of the late Sen. Kennedy's staffers will receive about \$16,350 and it is very hard to believe such an across-the-board deal is non-political. Rather, it smacks blatantly of "Okay, boys, we'll take care of you." No matter how truly sorry one feels for a group of people whose employer was murdered, one is forced to say that their subsidy by a tax-exempt foundation is a very questionable affair.

The blatancy of the Ford Foundation's evident political action in the case of the eight Robert Kennedy staffers lends substance to the speculation that Albert Shanker may not be so wrong and there may be other equally blatant political aspects of the Ford Foundation. Some official group representing taxpayers' interests ought to look into it, despite all its glib alibis.

[From the Wanderer, Nov. 14, 1968]

CONTROVERSIAL ACTIVITIES SUPPORTED BY TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS—CORPORATION FRONTS

(By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

WASHINGTON.—The American taxpayer is paying untold millions of dollars to finance the efforts of tax-exempt lobby groups to obtain special favors on U.S. Government contracts.

A case in point is the National Council of Technical Service Industries, Inc., of Washington, D.C. This supposedly "nonprofit, educational association" is bankrolled to the tune of more than \$500,000 annually by private profit-making corporations with a direct, vested interest in obtaining Government contracts. Through its links with prominent Government figures and the efforts of its lobby law firm, Arnold & Porter, the National Council of Technical Service Industries is seeking to perpetuate its favored position in competing for the \$8.5 billion which the Government lets out for labor costs each year.

Obviously, it is in a favorable position to gain its ends, even if they are detrimental to the interests of the American taxpayer. Sheldon S. Cohen, now Commissioner of Internal Revenue, was formerly a partner in Arnold & Porter. This law firm has substantial business before the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Mrs. Abe Fortas, wife of Associate Supreme Court Justice Abe Fortas, now heads a team of fifty lawyers in the firm, specializing in tax law.

The main activity of the National Council of Technical Service Industries is to preserve its advantage in obtaining contracts with Government agencies without the interplay of competition and other economic factors in the private market. This is made plain by its testimony before Congressional committees and by a letter of September 27th, 1968, from E. R. Wagner, executive director of the National Council of Technical Service Industries, to Democratic Representative Porter Hardy Jr. from Virginia, chairman of a Government Operations subcommittee. Wagner's letter to Representative Hardy protested the subcommittee's recommendation to revise Circular A-76 produced by the Bureau of the Budget. This recom-

mendation, endorsed by the full House Government Operations Committee, would require the Government to make cost comparisons before letting out contracts for clerical, labor and professional services.

Wagner wrote Hardy: "These recommendations would vitiate the present policies of Circular A-76 by forcing industry to compete with the Government on the basis of comparative costs on every support service contract."

Representative Hardy indignantly replied to Wagner's letter, saying: You seek a position of advantage where the Government would not even experience the stabilizing effect normally provided by the interplay of competition and other economic factors in the private market."

By their lobbying activities the National Council of Technical Service Industries seeks to avoid this competition on a free market. Its membership lists include subsidiaries of gigantic corporations who use the tax-exempt "think factory" technique as the means for getting the public to pick up the tab for their lobbying activities.

The membership of the National Council of Technical Service Industries is composed of the following seventeen firms: Avco Field Engineering (a department of Avco Electronics which is a division of Avco Corporation); Bendix Field Engineering Corporation (a subsidiary of the Bendix Corporation); Computer Sciences Corporation; Computing & Software, Inc.; Federal Electric Corporation (a subsidiary of International Telephone & Telegraph); Kay & Associates, Inc., Field Services Division—LITCOM (a division of Litton Industries, Inc.); Lockheed Electronics Company (a division of Lockheed Aircraft Corporation); Manpower, Inc.; Northrop Support Operations Development (Northronics, a division of Northrop Corporation); Philco-Ford Corporation; Pollak & Skan, Inc. (a subsidiary of Harris-Intertype Corporation); RCA Service Company (a division of Radio Corporation of America); Service Technology Corporation (a subsidiary of LTV Aerospace Corporation); Field Services Division of Unitek Industries, Inc.

John F. Griner, president of the American Federation of Government Employees (AFL-CIO), has written a letter to Internal Revenue Service Director Sheldon S. Cohen asking the IRS to investigate the National Council of Technical Service Industries "to ascertain whether it properly qualifies as a 'non-profit educational association' under the IRS regulations." Griner quoted from the September issue of the tax-exempt group's newsletter which said that articles in *Forbes* magazine and *Nation's Business* had been arranged by Thomas F. Stone, director of public relations for the National Council of Technical Service Industries.

Griner said: "The facts which we have received and cited to you suggest strongly that there is a presumption that the National Council of Technical Service Industries is not a *bona fide* 'non-profit educational association,' but is, instead, primarily an advertising, propagandizing and lobbying organization designed to bring commercial advantage and enhanced profits to its clients who are represented directly on its board of directors."

The problem involved here is the difficulty of the taxpayer in getting a break, when persons linked to the lobby law firms and their corporation fronts occupy high Government posts.

[By the Wanderer, Nov. 28, 1968]

GOVERNMENT WITHIN A GOVERNMENT

(By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

WASHINGTON.—The Ford Foundation's controversial role in restructuring New York City's public-school system has once more brought into question the power and influence of America's gigantic, tax-exempt founda-

tations which operate entirely outside democratic processes.

The tax-exempt philanthropic corporations, such as the Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Foundation can best be understood by comparing them to the secularized monastic and teaching orders in the Middle Ages which acquired vast tax-exempt properties. Like these self-perpetuating feudal entities, the foundations are able to operate as virtual governments, but immune from any type of public or legal accountability.

The operations in New York City of the Ford Foundation typically illustrates the ruthless tactics used by the foundation's self-described "elite" in their drive for political power. One of the Ford Foundation's goals has been to fundamentally change the direction and control of New York City's public-school system. City educational institutions provide the Ford Foundation with a vehicle in their drive to control minority and ethnic groups in urban areas through dollars distributed to key personnel who will be beholden to them.

The problem here is that without normal checks and balances or any sort of genuine accountability, the door is left open for the school system to fall into the hands of unqualified persons and extremists of various sorts. An instance is the case of Herman Ferguson, principal of IS 55 in the Ocean Hill-Brownsville Demonstration School District in Brooklyn, New York, which was set up under a Ford Foundation grant. Ferguson was arrested and recently convicted of conspiracy in Queens, according to *New York Magazine* of November 18th. He was alleged to be a member of the Black Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM) and was found guilty of conspiring to kill NAACP Executive Director Roy Wilkins and Urban League Director Whitney Young.

This situation was made possible when the New York Board of Education permitted the local board to make its own appointments not only of the Unit Administrator but of principals, even when these principals were not on the city's examination lists.

Teachers who objected or would not fall into line with this breakdown in regularized procedures and the integrity of the schools were simply ordered transferred. A report by Dr. John H. Niemeyer, president of the Bank Street College of Education, disclosed that last Spring the Board of Education told the local government board that teachers considered unacceptable could be transferred out of the district so long as no great publicity was attached to such transfers. Obviously, the one thing which the Ford Foundation and the people it works with do not want is publicity or public debate concerning their operations and the issues involved.

Albert Shanker, president of the United Federation of Teachers, has voiced objections of teachers asking for "the right of due process." He has charged that "a very substantial number" of members of the Board of Education "are in such great debt to the Ford Foundation that they cannot act independently."

Among the three board members which he identified as receiving Ford Foundation assistance is Rev. Milton Galamison who heads an organization called School and Community Organized for Partnership in Education which has received \$160,000 from the Ford Foundation. Galamison has been arrested nine times for demonstrations against city school policies. He organized last May a one-day boycott in support of demands for greater community control of schools by Negroes in Brooklyn.

The political motivation of the Ford Foundation's activities are plainly seen in the sort of persons receiving its grants. This led Shanker to say that the Ford Foundation ought to be treated as a "political lobby" and

should lose its tax-exempt status and be "required to fully disclose the extent" of its "activities in this field."

From the point of view of the foundations themselves, this might be a wise move. The properties of the monastic orders were finally confiscated when they became involved in secular, partisan political activities. This Nation's giant tax-exempt foundations are preparing for themselves the same sort of fate.

[From the Wanderer, Dec. 12, 1968]

A MANIPULATED FOREIGN SERVICE

(By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

WASHINGTON.—When President Nixon sets out to put into effect his promised revolution in the management of the State Department, he will have to cope with the Department's built-in and highly effective techniques for lobbying the Congress and resisting change.

Clearly, the door is left open to outside manipulation of the Foreign Service when Government officials accept ties with tax-exempt foundations and private companies. They do this to entrench themselves in power or to put across policies which they favor.

A case in point is the simultaneous revelations that the Donner Foundation gave \$33,000 to the American Foreign Service Association and that fourteen State Department employees and a New York real-estate magnate with State Department connections gave generous campaign contributions to Democratic Representative — from New York —, of the House Appropriations Committee, exercises control over spending by the State Department and related overseas activities.

The Donner grant was received by the American Foreign Service Association under a new policy installed this year by a so-called "young Turk" group of activist Foreign Service officers aggressively determined to free the Foreign Service from the last vestiges of control by the Congress. As part of this program in 1968 the American Foreign Service Association has received more than \$100,000, including gifts from John D. Rockefeller III, William Averell Harriman, Mrs. William Rivkin, the widow of a well-known lobby lawyer, and Mrs. Christian Herter, widow of the former Secretary of State who was on the World Peace Foundation. Significantly, William Bray III, a "young Turk" member of the board of the American Foreign Service Association, was granted six-months' leave of absence from the State Department without pay to carry out this aggressive policy, but his entire salary is being paid by John D. Rockefeller III during this period.

The influence of the Donner Foundation is seen by the fact that it picked up the tab for a conference held in Washington, D.C., November 14th and 15th, by the American Foreign Service Association. This was announced by the conference chairman. The underlying theme of the conference was the retention of power by "the Eastern Establishment" through personnel selection. A string of Government consultants attended, such as Arthur Larson, former head of the U.S. Information Agency, and Adam Yarmolinsky, who helped staff key policy posts in the Kennedy Administration.

The two-day conference was chaired by Joseph Esrey Johnson, president of the tax-exempt Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, who is referred to by insiders as "the permanent unofficial Secretary of State." Johnson was formerly with the State Department's policy-planning staff and one of the architects while there with Alger Hiss of the United Nations. A member of the American Foreign Service Association who attended the conference told this writer that

it was Johnson who suggested foundation funding for the Association.

The implications are plain: The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the Donner Foundation and other New York foundations are using the American Foreign Service Association as a lobbying front for major legislative changes to be proposed in 1969 affecting the structure and role of the American Foreign Service. Significantly, the American Foreign Service Association has proposed that power over personnel selections, promotions and firings should be vested solely in a board of the Foreign Service, which would be a semi-independent agency. Not unexpectedly, the Association proposed that Johnson be the board chairman.

Outside influences are at work, too, in the case of the contributions made by State Department officials to Representative —'s re-election. Of significance in this affair is the role of Norman K. Winston, the New York realtor who owns several companies and has been given honorific jobs by the State Department. Winston was the largest donor to Representative Rooney's campaign committee, while the wife of Idar Rimestad, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, is listed as giving \$500. Rimestad, who is formally charged with all of the State Department's budgeting, financing and contracts, is the Department official who works closest with Rooney.

In 1966 Winston reimbursed Rimestad's predecessor in the job, William J. Crockett, for out-of-pocket expenses for a cocktail party and fund-raising dinner for Democratic legislators. In order to cover up traces of this subsidy, Winston resorted to the device of transferring to Crockett stock at a price lower than the market value which Crockett in turn was able to sell at a price high enough to pay for his expenses. This has come out in the press here. Thus, in effect Crockett and Winston had an arrangement whereby Crockett was acting as a lobbyist for Winston while concealing this relationship.

The moral is that if there is to be any real change in the present system, new men must be brought in who will resist outside interests and pressures. Freedom from conflicting outside financial relationships are a prerequisite for disinterested public service.

[From the Wanderer, Dec. 19, 1968]

MAGIC AND POLITICS

(By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

WASHINGTON.—Any serious student of politics sooner or later stumbles upon the existence of a goofy network. These are the secular cults which attract bored socialites and cash-register types in search of a common humanity. As semi-secretive networks, they serve in addition as convenient covers for activities by international cartels and worldwide intelligence services.

During the days of the New Deal, a congeries of political and financial figures, including Vice President Henry Wallace, became mixed up with a Russian "guru" called Nicholas Roerich who presided over a Tibetan lamasery on Riverside Drive in New York City. Wallace sent his guru to Asia to examine grass seed under a grant from the Department of Agriculture. In his book entitled *The Coming of The New Deal*, Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr. wrote that Wallace even induced Treasury Secretary Henry M. Morgenthau to place the symbol of the cult on the U.S. dollar bill. This is the "all-seeing eye" above a truncated pyramid.

We see the same symbolism today in the architectural plan for the Temple of Understanding, the "Spiritual United Nations," that is being constructed on the banks of the Potomac River in Washington, D.C. The \$5-million edifice will feature the symbolism of black magic practiced by the high priests

of ancient Egypt. The building will contain a giant eye—a circular pool of water which reflects light beamed onto it by a dome faceted to resemble a many-colored diamond.

The Temple movement, which has offices in the Nation's Capital, embraces esoteric activities in India, Great Britain, Holland, Belgium, Israel, the United Arab Republic, Poland, Union of South Africa, Ghana, and other countries. Cooperating groups include Lucis Trust, a tax-exempt, non-profit corporation which operates the Arcane School, World Goodwill and Triangles, with offices in the United States at 866 UN Plaza, New York City. These groups regularly hold "Full Moon Meditation Meetings" to promote the "New World Religion" at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Here, groups of "New World Servers" are instructed to form "triangles"—groups of three—consisting of "a network of Light and Goodwill covering the entire planet."

The arcane or hidden mysteries of the Temple also include planned political mysteries. Recently, the Donner Foundation gave the non-profit Temple of Understanding a \$15,000 grant. At the same time, the Donner Foundation gave the American Foreign Service Association \$33,000 at the suggestion of Joseph E. Johnson, president of the Carnegie Endowment, who is known as the "Emcee of the Eastern Establishment." Johnson is using the American Foreign Service Association and the Donner Foundation as fronts during the interval between the Presidential election and the inauguration to manipulate State Department staffing.

The Temple of Understanding has impressive political support. The Temple was endorsed by President Johnson. A Temple brochure lists endorsements by eight ambassadors and a number of important Government officials, including Robert Strange McNamara while Defense Secretary. The brochure also lists an endorsement by Dr. Reuben S. Nathan when he was policy director of Radio Free Europe (which has CIA links) before he went to Vietnam for psychological-warfare operations.

The president of the Donner Foundation, which helped to subsidize the Temple of Understanding and the American Foreign Service Association, is Franklyn Johnson, formerly a desk officer at CIA and later a CIA consultant.

The executive director of the Temple of Understanding is Finley Peter Dunne Jr., whose father was the creator of "Mr. Dooley," the comical and loveable Irish barkeeper who was a well-known fictional character in stories at the turn of the century. The latest news bulletin produced by Middlesex, a private preparatory school for boys in Concord, Mass., which was Dunne's *alma mater*, proudly describes his activities as general chairman of the "Spiritual Summit Conference" in Darjeeling last October. The conference, sponsored by the Temple of Understanding, brought together Christians, Buddhists, Moslems, Confucionists, Hindus and Jews. "The first time it's really been tried," the school bulletin quoted Dunne as saying.

[From the Wanderer, Dec. 26, 1968]

THE FOUNDATION MACHINE

(By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

WASHINGTON.—The appointment of Alan Pifer, president of the Carnegie Corporation of New York, to head a special education group for President-elect Nixon raises anew the problem of Congressional oversight over policy-setting, tax-exempt foundations.

Pifer is seeking to set educational priority and to win Presidential blessing for a strong policy center for higher education "close to the summit of the Federal Government." This would provide a channel for a tight, interlocking directorate of giant foundations, corporations and New York-Washington po-

litical law firms to exert an increasing monopoly over American cultural life.

But the road ahead is not as smooth as the "philanthropoids" might wish. They must cope with increasing resentment over their attempt to dominate the educational scene—some of it by professional educators as in New York City. There is no question, too, that the public has become aware that behind lofty claims of disinterested public service, there exists a politically motivated foundation machine—an Eastern Establishment mafia determined to brook no interference in its affairs.

In an attempt to dampen and control this mounting criticism, Pifer suggested in the Carnegie Corporation's annual report that foundations set up an independent commission to recommend forms of public accountability. This commission would serve as a lightning rod to deflect criticism to the point where it becomes manageable by the foundations themselves. It would ensure that no outside body that is free of ties to the big foundations could properly exercise objective oversight over their activities. From such a haughty citadel, foundation publicists could brand as "anti-intellectual" and "crackpot" any objective, honest attempt to delve into their supposedly philanthropic operations.

Even now the Carnegie Corporation is facing protests from parents whose children are exposed to the textbooks financed by the foundation under its "Project Read." This project provides programmed textbooks for schools, particularly in "culturally deprived areas." An estimated five million school children throughout the Nation are using the material in the programmed textbooks produced by the Behavioral Research Laboratories, Palo Alto, Calif.

This writer has gone over these textbooks in the "Reading" series financed by the Carnegie Corporation and authored by M. W. Sullivan, a linguist. These foundation-funded books reveal a fire pattern that amounts to an incitement to the sort of arson and guerrilla warfare that took place in Watts, Washington, D.C., and elsewhere. On one page in the series we find a torch next to a white porch. The caption reads invitingly, "a torch, a porch." Further along, there is a picture of a man smiling while he holds a torch aloft. The caption beneath it reads: "This man has a torch in his hand." The children are required as an exercise to insert the missing letter to fill in the word torch. The next picture shows the burning torch touching the porch, with a caption, "a torch on a porch." Thus, the children are led in stages to the final act that suggests itself quite naturally. The picture of a burning house is shown with a caption that predicts: "This shack will burn up." The next picture in the series shows a hand moving the hands of a clock to twenty-five minutes past one, while this same shack is being devoured by flames. The message is plain: an example of a man who deliberately commits the criminal act of setting a home on fire.

Tragically, these young children are being indoctrinated with a pattern of anti-social ideas that will completely and violently alienate them from the mainstream of American middle-class values. Other pictures in the Carnegie-funded, supposedly educational texts include a comparison of a flag with a rag, the ransoming of an American soldier in a Chinese prison, a picture that shows people kneeling in a church to say their prayers beside a picture of a horse being taught to kneel in the same way, a reference to a candidate elected to public office as a "ruler," a picture of a boy stealing a girl's purse, and another boy throwing pointed darts at a companion whom he uses as target practice.

Understandably, the Carnegie-financed books are causing concern to local law-enforcement officials, many of whom have to

cope with riot or near-riot conditions. Ellen Morphonios, prosecutor for Florida in its attorney's office, and a chief of its Criminal Court Division, said recently: "It's a slap in the face and an insult to every member of the Negro community, saying that the only way to communicate with Negro children is to show a robber or violence. It's like subliminal advertising. If this isn't subversive and deliberately done as part of a master plan . . . Only a sick mind could have produced it."

Repeated instances of this type of antisocial activity obviously constitute a strong argument for removing the tax-exempt status of these educational foundations, and for curbing their activities by Federal regulations and Congressional oversight.

[From the Houston Tribune, Dec. 17, 1968]

NEGRO OFFICE SEEKERS AIDED BY FOUNDATION

WASHINGTON.—A little-noticed venture into politics by the Ford Foundation is being watched closely here by political leaders of both parties.

The left-leaning, non-profit organization, whose funds for experimental school decentralization helped ignite New York City's longest teachers' strike, has begun making grants to assist Negroes to run for state and national offices.

Under the first of several projects planned by the foundation, the Urban Affairs Foundation of Los Angeles has received a half million dollars to train Negro graduate students for careers in politics.

"BREAKTHROUGH"

Under present plans, each political trainee will be farmed out to a minority elected politician who will help him learn the political ropes and make the necessary party contacts.

As vividly put by California State Sen. Mervyn Dymally, a Negro, who will be in charge of getting the program off the ground:

"Reapportionment after 1970 is going to be the real breakthrough for black men in politics. We hope to see minority representation tripled after reapportionment, both nationally and in California."

There are now nine Negro members of Congress including one woman. The goal set by McGeorge Bundy, president of Ford Foundation, is to increase this number to at least 30 by 1973.

VAST CHANGES

Under plans worked out by Bundy, the new political training program is an integral part of a grand design to bring vast social, economic, and political changes to the U.S. in the '70s.

This revolutionary new Ford Foundation program will be tied closely to the establishment in the nation's capital later this month of a Center for Community Change (CCC).

This highly controversial project, scheduled to receive \$5 million from the Ford Foundation, is the brain child of Walter F. Reuther, president of the United Automobile Workers (UAW).

The CCC will be headed by Jack T. Conway, former director of AFL-CIO's Industrial Union Department, and one of Reuther's most trusted aides.

MANY GROUPS

Conway's first assignment will be to mobilize broad support for radical social projects in the field of housing, education, and anti-poverty work.

The new social action front will include such groups as the Citizens Crusade Against Poverty, The Social Development Corporation, black militant groups, and the more militant unions associated with Reuther's UAW.

Reuther will be on the CCC's board of directors along with Cesar Chavez, director of

AFL-CIO's farm workers union, and migrant-labor organizing program, and Paul Schrade, West Coast director of UAW.

Schrade is co-chairman of the "New Democratic Coalition" formed after the November election to try to take control of the Democratic party. The group is made up dominantly of Democrats who favored the presidential candidacies of Sen. Eugene McCarthy and the late Sen. Robert Kennedy.

SEEK TO BUILD COALITION

One of the long-range projects of the Center for Community Changes will be to create issues behind which a broad-based coalition of black militants, the poor, students, labor, and farm groups can unite for political action.

Past efforts of Reuther to put together such a coalition with the help of the late Dr. Martin Luther King and Sen. Robert Kennedy fell apart with their violent deaths.

In working closely with the multi-billion dollar Ford Foundation, Reuther hopes to enlist the new breed of militant politicians to help hammer together the political coalition.

[From the Lynchburg (Va.) News, Oct. 15, 1967]

DOUBLE STANDARD BY INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE—HOW L. B. J. SUPPRESSES ANTICOMMUNISM

There no longer can be any doubt that the Johnson Administration has embarked on a deliberate campaign to suppress pro-American, anti-Communist organizations. It is attacking them through the Federal Communications Commission and the Internal Revenue Service.

No attempt has been made, of course, to apply FCC restrictions or to remove the tax exemptions of Communist-front and leftist organizations—some of which are receiving Federal tax money.

In recent months, the IRS has canceled the tax exemptions of the Christian Crusade and the church operated by Dr. Billy James Hargis, and of the Committee of Christian Laymen, Inc., of Woodland Hills, California. The IRS has now embarked on an examination of the American Farm Bureau Federation—the largest farmers' organization in the country.

The FCC has instituted suit to cancel the license of radio station WXUR owned by Faith Theological Seminary, a Conservative, anti-Communist seminary. On August 14, the FCC issued an order to radio stations providing a fine of \$500 a day up to a maximum of \$10,000 for the broadcast of any programs which attack persons or organizations, regardless of whether the facts presented are true. Under such an order, programs could not attack Gus Hall, head of the Communist Party, without the radio station notifying Hall and offering him free time to reply! The order will dry up criticism of Communists and Communism over the air waves.

In revoking the tax exemption of the Committee of Christian Laymen, the IRS stated: "Your publications are concerned primarily in documenting the actions of the National Council of Churches and its affiliated denominations. Several of your publications also are concerned with the activities of Mr. Walter Reuther. . . . Your publications are concerned with showing that certain persons and the National Council of Churches are promoting the objectives of the Communist Party. This does not instruct or train an individual or the public for the purpose of improving or developing their capabilities on a subject useful to the individual and beneficial to the community."

Exposing Communist objectives and infiltration, in the IRS's opinion, is not useful or beneficial.

On August 31, the IRS notified the World Youth Crusade for Freedom, Inc., that its

application for tax-exemption as a non-profit organization, had been denied. The IRS denied the WYCF's application on the same grounds that it revoked the tax exemption of the Committee of Christian Laymen.

The purposes of the WYCF, according to the IRS letter:

" . . . are to stimulate concerned activity of freedom-loving students and youth groups throughout the world; to prepare, coordinate and finance programs for the exchange of students and other representatives between the United States and other countries to further international understanding; to communicate information from these activities to the public at large, particularly the educational community."

The IRS noted that the youth group's activities, as summarized in the application for tax exemption, consisted of:

" . . . sending representatives to Asian countries to foster the establishment of local units to activate youth throughout the world in opposition to Communism; the publishing of a newsletter and memoranda concerning activities of the organization; and holding a seminar at Yale University in connection with the creation of the Freedom Corps, and you have organized the Student Committee for a Free China (SCFC)."

Despite acknowledging these purposes and activities of the organization, the IRS denied the application for tax-exemption on the grounds that "you are not organized and operated for educational purposes within the meaning of the Code and regulations."

The Code (Section 501(c)(3)) provides for exemption of these organizations:

"(3) Corporations, and any community chest, fund, or foundation, organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, testing for public safety, literary, or educational purposes, or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence legislation, and which does not participate in, or intervene in (including the publishing or distributing of statements), any political campaign on behalf of and candidate for public office."

The Code defines the term "educational" as:

"(a) The instructing of the public on subjects useful to the individual for the purpose of improving or developing his capabilities; or (b) The instruction of the public on subjects useful to the individual and beneficial to the community."

The WYCF, in the opinion of the IRS, did not meet these qualifications or definitions!

The IRS has never questioned, however, the tax exempt status of the National Student Association—which has been aided with millions of tax dollars in grants from the Central Intelligence Agency. The NSA follows the Communist line on many domestic and foreign issues, and is extreme Leftwing on all others.

Nor has the IRS questioned the tax-exempt status of the Center for Democratic Institutions, which has financed and promoted Leftwing causes for years. The Center's most recent pro-Communist activity consisted of helping fund and promote the National Conference of New Politics held in September in Chicago, where "delegates" called for the overthrow of the American system of government and the establishment of a Socialist state.

This, according to the IRS, comes within the Code's interpretation of "educational."

Slowly but surely the Johnsoncrats are choking the Conservatives, anti-Communist organizations to death while permitting—and helping finance with tax money—organizations promoting the leftist anti-American, anti-Christian line.

[From the Christian Crusade]
INTERNAL RAKEOFF SERVICE

NEW YORK.—26 Tax Agents Arrested. Internal Revenue inspection agents arrested 26 top-grade federal tax agents and an accountant today for allegedly paying \$10,000 in bribes to an investigation inspector. Authorities said the inspector had been investigating corruption in the Internal Revenue Service and the bribes were paid by the agents to obtain confidential information about themselves or quash investigations of bribe attempts of which they were suspect.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Courier,
Feb. 12, 1968]

TAX-FREE FOUNDATIONS FINANCE REVOLUTION (By George Schuyler)

Government money, tax-free foundation money, and money furnished by the Communists, is gradually destroying this country. Money is pouring into the "black revolution" from all three sources named and no one knows the total amount being spent or what proportion is coming from each of these sources.

Today big funds and foundations, local and national, have taken over the financial obligation of backing the "revolution" with substantial long green. The Ford Foundation recently announced a \$200,000 grant to the Reverend King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference to aid non-violent protest (which always seems to end up violently). Previously King's clansmen were trained at the Highlander Research and Education Center in Knoxville, Tenn., and the Dorchester Center in Liberty County, Ga., whence they scattered over the Deep South infecting the populace.

In a generous mood, the Ford Foundation has also given \$522,200 to leftist National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice for its interdenominational program, project equality, which seeks to overcome racial discrimination in employment. It already operates in 12 metropolitan areas, pressuring religious institutions and suppliers to review their hiring practices "and to act to improve them if necessary," a seemingly ominous note.

Not long ago the Ford Foundation handed over \$150,000 to the Cleveland CORE, which came just in the nick of time. The landlord was about to oust the group from its headquarters and the telephone had been cut off. It looked as if the agitators who had worked so valiantly to incite the Hough race riot in the Ohio metropolis would have to get jobs.

Ford saved the day and the sighs of relief could be heard in Hanol.

The hotbeds of radical agitation in the "ghetto" are well stocked with assorted Negro "Intellectuals"—actors, writers and singers—who have recently switched from integration back to segregation. Not surprisingly, the Ford Foundation came up with the money needed to accelerate the avant-garde trend. In 1967 it made a \$434,000 grant for a three-year period to the Negro Ensemble Company (NEC). The first play it produced off Broadway was an alien import devoted to the "horrors" of the Portuguese Africa. That's show business, these days.

A separate Negro theater has been established in an old theater building in Harlem where, without white subsidy, a group of Negro actors produced Shakespeare and current Broadway hits as far back as 1912 and periodically until the Depression. To the new Jim Crow enterprise Ford gave \$18,000. Rockefeller gave \$17,500. The New York State Arts Council forked over \$5,000, and two anonymous members of the Rockefeller family gave \$2,500 each. All tax-exempt of course.

The Rockefeller foundation gave a grant of \$62,500 over three years to the Free

Southern Theatre (FST), an integrated group of actors which has roamed the rural South since 1963 where propaganda plays have been taken to communities without theaters. Its repertoire has been less concerned with Shakespeare than with Marx.

The Mellon millions, siphoned through the late Stephen Currier's taconic foundation, helped to sustain the "Revolution" in Mississippi and elsewhere. The National Council of Churches helped bankroll the Delta Ministry and aided the "Revolution" in the Mississippi poondocks, even to the takeover of federal property. Along with funds from UAW's treasury and coin shifted from anti-poverty funds, the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party was long sustained and will rise again.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Tribune, Jan. 25, 1968]

TAXPAYERS SUBSIDIZE REVOLT (By Alice Widener)

NEW YORK CITY.—Each dollar of income received by a tax-exempt foundation is a dollar that did not furnish revenue to the U.S. Government. All money received by foundations is granted exemption from taxation by the U.S. Treasury, meaning by grace of all Americans. Is it to our national interest, I should like to ask, for the Treasury to grant tax-exemption to the Fund of the Republic?

The Fund subsidizes a think-tank, The Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, at Santa Barbara, California. Currently, it is distributing widely to schools a document "Students and Society" which is a report on a student conference held at the Center last summer. In the report is a paper presented to the conference by student Stephen Saltonstall of Yale University, who entitled his work "Toward a Strategy of Disruption." What Saltonstall wishes to disrupt is our society and he calls for small, disciplined groups of student "shock troops" to achieve his aims. In print, at U.S. taxpayers' sufferance, the Fund for the Republic's Center permits Stephen Saltonstall to call for the "intimidation and humiliation" of public figures.

LAWLESS ACTIVITIES URGED

What has "intimidation" to do with democratic procedures and institutions? Intimidation is the weapon of autocracy or tyranny. Mr. Saltonstall calls on students to harry university professors and researchers "at their homes." Is invasion of privacy a part of "democratic" procedure? Stephen Saltonstall also suggests—in funded black-on-white, believe it or not—"The introduction of a small quantity of LSD in only five or six government department coffee-urns might be a highly effective tactic."

It could be a lethal one. State and federal narcotics control officials have informed me that a dose of LSD administered in coffee to a person suffering from an undetected physical ailment, such as a heart condition or diabetes, could be extremely harmful physically and perhaps fatal. From state and federal legal authorities, I learned that tampering with government property—such as a coffee urn or drinking fountain—is illegal.

"CASTRATE AMERICA"

A foreword to "Students and Society" by W. H. Ferry, vice president of the Fund's Center, states, "This is an edited record of the conference proceedings." Therefore Saltonstall's suggestions were printed with malice aforethought. Ferry also states, "The conference on Students and Society was made possible by a generous contribution from S. Herbert Meller of New York City." Meller is an investment banker with Meller & Co., One Chase Manhattan Plaza.

Ferry says "the mood" of Students and Society is "hammering discontent, combined

with impatience for action." The Fund for the Republic and Meller are subsidizing that mood. It bodes ill for all of us.

[From the Dan Smoot Report, Jan. 1, 1968]
WHY SHOULD THE NCC BE TAX EXEMPT?

"Old-fashioned atheism traveled at its own expense. The new atheism wraps itself in the sheep's clothing of Christendom and draws its sustenance from Christianity which it seeks to destroy. The foremost organization in this destructive operation is the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. (NCC)."

The NCC is exempt from federal taxation because of its official commitment that it "shall not engage in influencing legislation or engage in lobbying."

What should be done about the National Council of Churches? Without question the Internal Revenue Service should enforce the law and cancel the NCC's exemption from federal taxation. But the NCC is a sacred cow that will not be touched by the IRS. Here then is something that individual Christians can do—they can starve the sacred cow to death by refraining from contributing to their churches as long as their churches are affiliated with the NCC.

DEATH OF DR. ROBERT P. WALTON

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 14, 1971

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, a respected and admired South Carolinian, Robert Petrie Walton, doctor of medicine and doctor of philosophy, died at the age of 66 last week in Charleston. He was a man of insight and invention. In 1938, Dr. Walton wrote the book entitled "Marihuana: America's New Drug Problem," and a device invented by him to measure certain heart functions is being used around the world. For 29 years, Dr. Walton served our State as professor of medicine at the South Carolina Medical University and has been instrumental in expanding the university.

Dr. Walton has served with honor and dignity in both public and private life, and we in South Carolina will miss him and his contributions to our State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Dr. Robert P. Walton," published in the March 30 edition of The News and Courier, and the article entitled "Dr. Walton Dies at 66 in Charleston Hospital," published in the March 29 edition of the State newspaper, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Mar. 29, 1971]

DR. WALTON DIES AT 66 IN CHARLESTON HOSPITAL

CHARLESTON.—Dr. Robert Petrie Walton, professor and chairman of the department of pharmacology at the Medical University of South Carolina, died Saturday in a local hospital after a brief illness. He was 66.

For the past 10 years Dr. Walton has been coordinator of research for the Medical University. He was chairman of the department of Pharmacology at the University of Missis-

issippi School of Medicine before coming to the S.C. Medical University in 1942.

Among his inventions was the strain gage arch, a device for measuring the contractile force of the heart muscle. This device is in use in the United States and a number of foreign countries.

Dr. Walton was the author and editor of a number of books and magazines. He wrote "Marijuana: America's New Drug Problem" in 1938. He was listed in Who's Who in America in 1940.

Dr. Walton was a former vice president of the South Carolina Heart Association. Twice he was presented the Medical University's top teaching award by the medical students.

Funeral services will be today at 4 p.m. in Bethel United Methodist Church. Burial will be in the family cemetery in Baton Rouge, La., Tuesday.

Surviving are his widow and two children. The family suggests that those who wish may make memorials to the Medical University of South Carolina Library Fund.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Mar. 30, 1971]

DR. ROBERT P. WALTON

As chairman of the Dept. of Pharmacology since 1942 and one of the key figures in expanding the Medical College of South Carolina to university status, Dr. Robert P. Walton made important contributions to his adopted State of South Carolina. A native of Kentucky, he held degrees both as doctor of philosophy and doctor of medicine.

Dr. Walton was studying and writing about the coming dope culture long before it was a subject of general concern. His book, "Marijuana, America's New Drug Problem," appeared in 1938, one of his four books and more than 100 technical papers. He was chairman of the faculty committee on construction for the teaching hospital, and coordinator of research. Dr. Walton was nationally recognized in professional circles. His death at 66 has ended a notable career, and removed from our community a respected and admired citizen.

CALLEY COURT VERDICT UNPOPULAR

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, to an overwhelming degree—if my mail is an accurate reflection—the Calley court verdict has been immensely unpopular. The outpouring of sentiment that has reached my desk since the announcement of the Calley verdict has been as disturbing as it has been dramatic.

Mr. Speaker, I can understand the sentiment expressed by some, that the sentence of life imprisonment was too severe. A good case can, I think, be made that a lesser charge than premeditated murder could be justified—one that did not carry with it the burden of a life sentence.

I can also understand the sentiment that it is simply not fair to single out one man to bear the burden of national guilt for any American misconduct in this war. There is, after all, something decent and healthy about the concern of the American people that one individual far down the chain of command not be made a convenient scapegoat by his superiors in that same command chain.

OXVII—659—Part 8

But Mr. Speaker, there are other sentiments which I can neither understand nor accept.

I cannot understand the furious attack made by some upon the decency and judgment of the six men who made up that jury. Lieutenant Calley, after all, was not judged by a bunch of stiff-necked brass hats with no understanding of the pressures of war. That jury was composed of six distinguished and honorable veterans of combat. Five of the six faced tough combat in Vietnam and one was awarded four Purple Hearts and two Silver Stars in Vietnam and Korea.

I cannot understand those who say, We ought to pin a medal on him, not punish him.

If we "pin a medal on him", what do we do with Jim Dursi, the rifleman in Calley's platoon who refused an order by Calley to open fire on some 15 civilians cowering in a ditch? What then, do we do with Lt. Hugh Thompson, a helicopter pilot who intervened to help rescue other civilians at My Lai?

I cannot agree with those who say, He only did what he was sent there to do.

Mr. Speaker, this is supposed to be a religious nation, with a deeply held reverence for life. No religious nation will "pin a medal" on a man who picks up a baby, throws him in a ditch and shoots him. And no nation with our heritage teaches its officers to butt-stroke a captive old man in the face and then blow his head off at pointblank range before moving on to "waste" the lives of at least 21 other captive defenseless civilians.

We are the Nation who said at Nuremberg that even in war, there are certain limits to man's inhumanity to other men. Our reaction to the Calley case and to the others that must surely follow will determine whether we have the moral stamina to apply to ourselves the same requirements for humane and decent conduct that we required of the Germans and the Japanese some 25 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder how many of those who blandly accept the mass killing of unarmed and helpless civilians at My Lai because "even the children of Hanoi's indoctrinated mothers must be feared by our servicemen" remember the North Vietnamese massacres at Hue and our sense of outrage at that senseless and brutal act of barbarism.

If we accept what happened at My Lai as "inevitable in the hell of war" have we not also condoned the unconscionable massacre at Hue? Are we really willing to adopt that wretched standard of humane conduct—even in war—as our own?

Mr. Speaker, Lieutenant Calley still has several avenues of appeal open to him in military and civilian court. None of us knows what the final outcome of his case will be, and no sober citizen or public official should attempt to pre-judge that final outcome before it arrives. The individual guilt or innocence of Lieutenant Calley must be determined on the basis of the facts of the case—on the basis of whether or not it can be proven that he did those things he is charged with doing.

But Mr. Speaker, there is another question which goes far beyond the Calley case. It is a question which cannot just be answered in the courtroom. It must be answered by America as a people. And it is terribly important to our national soul that it be answered in the right way. That question is simply what standards of conduct, what degree of compassion and humanity we are going to stand for.

As William Greider said in the Washington Post:

If America adopts as a customary standard—barbaric as it is—the rule that it's permissible to shoot prisoners, then America should be prepared to accept the results of that standard. The link between the My Lai victims and the American POW's held in Hanoi is real and important—they are protected by the same rules. It is a great national hypocrisy to rally outrage on the POW issue, then pat Calley on the back for what he did to the prisoners at My Lai.

Mr. Speaker, it is not only hypocrisy, it is downright dangerous.

For the sake of every man who is ever required to make war for his country, and even more for the sake of our vision of ourselves, America must stand for the principle set down in our first military code drawn up in the Civil War that says "men who take up arms against one another in public war do not cease on this account to be moral beings responsible to one another and to God."

VISIT TO ISRAEL: A REPORT

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I recently returned from a privately financed visit to Israel—my third trip to that brave nation since 1952. My wife and I traveled about the country, visiting particularly some of the former Arab lands now under Israeli jurisdiction as an outcome of the 1967 war. I have written a report to my constituents in the 23d District of New York on this trip, which appeared recently in the Riverdale, N.Y., Press. Some of the observations contained in that report will be of interest to the many Members of Congress who are concerned over developments in the Middle East. The full text of my report follows:

ISRAEL TODAY

(By Jonathan B. Bingham)

Like other recent visitors to Israel, June and I were astonished at the open borders that exist, not only in Jerusalem, but between Israel proper and the "West Bank" areas. In Jericho, Bethlehem and Ramallah we saw only occasional Arab policemen, no Israeli troops. The Arab policemen wore the only guns we saw.

We talked with distinguished Palestinians who want to see an independent Palestine or a Palestine-Jordan federation, but who are confident that such an Arab state could not only live in peace with Israel, but could benefit from Israel's thriving and labor-scarce economy.

Most astonishing of all is the situation in the Gaza Strip itself. This area of 350,000 inhabitants, of which 200,000 are in refugee

camps, was totally stagnant under the Egyptians, a breeding ground for bitterness and hatred.

Today there is no unemployment. Anyone who wants to work can get a job. In spite of the efforts of the terrorists to stop them by occasional grenade attacks, 16,000 Arabs from Gaza are today working in Israel, commuting daily of weekly.

Thousands more are employed in orange-packing plants and other local industries, financed by the Israelis and utilizing a new power line.

The increasing fluidity of the situation—and the consequent growing of mutual confidence and understanding—is illustrated by the fact that Arabs from Gaza can readily get permits to enter Israel and can travel across Israel to the West Bank area without any permits whatever. On the highway down to Jericho, we passed perhaps 50 trucks loaded with oranges from Gaza on their way to Jordan to be sold there!

In recent months more and more Arabs from outside have travelled to Israel, especially to visit the holy Muslim places in Jerusalem. In my judgment, all of this activity may in time be more important to the future stability of the area than the documents that the statesmen may eventually sign.

Here are a few additional items, in a different vein:

I used to complain that the Israelis don't understand about good Jewish cooking, but I'll have to stop saying that. The General in command of the northern Sinai gave us a luncheon with his staff at his headquarters in Gaza. The food was excellent and might have come from a Riverdale delicatessen.

The Israelis do things so well that it's almost a relief when you see some one act like a schlemiel. In Gaza our car was escorted by Israeli jeeps fore and aft, out of an abundance of caution. At one point on the road the Colonel in command, who was riding with us, suddenly told our driver to stop, because he thought he saw an Israeli soldier picking an orange from a roadside tree.

This turned out not to be the case, but while we were stopped, the forward jeep sped ahead. About a mile down the road, one of the soldiers looked around—and back they came, somewhat sheepish.

The Church of the Holy Sepulchre has been restored by the various church organization responsible, and is far brighter and less cluttered than it used to be. The magnificent Muslim shrine known as the Dome of the Rock is in the care of Muslims. Access to these holy places is of course free to all. This is in sharp contrast to the period from 1948 to 1967 when the Jordanian government barred Israeli Jews from the revered Western Wall.

These various activities are being undertaken by the Israelis, not because they want to hold on to Gaza or most of the West Bank, but because they want to show what open borders and Arab-Jewish cooperation can do for all concerned. And of course word of what is happening gets out to the rest of the Arab world and has its impact.

BINGHAMS ARE OPTIMISTIC ON MIDEAST PEACE PACT

(By Jonathan B. Bingham)

On a recent six-day visit to Israel, my wife June, and I were once again heartened by the remarkable achievement of this remarkable country.

When we were first there, in 1952, we were impressed that Israel was surviving at all, faced as she was with seemingly impossible economic problems. We wondered how the Israeli leaders could sleep, not knowing how they were going to pay for the next ship-load of grain coming into Haifa harbor.

In 1964, we were struck by the amazing economic and industrial growth that had occurred in such a small and vulnerable

land. We saw the new aqueduct built to carry water from the upper Jordan to the Negev, and the new cities created to accommodate tens of thousands of immigrants from many parts of the world.

In February 1971, what impressed us most was the calm and courageous way in which the Israelis are moving toward a new era of peace and stability, hopefully, for the Middle East. They know that such an era is not likely to come tomorrow or the next day, but it is, they are confident, on the way. The trends are in the right direction.

The Israelis, quite properly, take a long view. With the perspective of thousands of years of history, they are not going to be rushed into accepting arrangements for a peace settlement that might collapse in five, ten or 20 years and leave them once again exposed.

At the same time, I believe our State Department is wrong in giving the impression that the Israelis are being rigid and inflexible in the face of a new spirit of compromise on the part of Egypt. The Israelis are, indeed, impressed with the drastic change in Egypt's attitude since the death of Nasser, but they are not for that reason going to be pressured into agreements that would be unwise for the future.

In particular, they do not want to be in a position of having to rely on assurances made by powers such as the Soviet Union and France; they have had sad experience with the unreliability of some international "guarantees" in the past.

Another trend that is highly favorable is the declining importance of the Palestinian terrorists. King Hussein has been able to reassert control in his own country. President Sadat of Egypt has told the Palestinian groups in no uncertain terms that they will not be allowed to prevent a peace settlement.

Another factor which is weakening the terrorists is the extraordinary job the Israelis are doing in the West Jordan areas and in the Gaza strip. Tens of thousands of Arabs from the "West Bank" and from the Gaza strip are working in Israel at far higher wages than they have ever had and learning that they can live in peace and prosperity side by side with the Jews they were brought up to hate and fear.

SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASE TOO LITTLE AND TOO LATE

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, less than 24 hours after a House-Senate conference committee submitted to this body the 10-percent across-the-board increase in social security benefits, it was passed by the House of Representatives. While I was certainly happy to see this body move so quickly in enacting this measure into law this year, I would like to point out that it is extremely unfortunate that this increase amounts to simply far too little, far too late.

Furthermore, because of the tardiness in the passage of this bill, social security beneficiaries will be subject to delays and inconveniences which would have been unnecessary had we acted sooner and passed this legislation during the 91st Congress.

While the 10-percent increase provided by this bill will be retroactive to January 1971, it is my understanding that

it will take the Social Security Administration nearly 3 months to change its records so that these new higher amounts can be paid. This means that social security beneficiaries will probably not begin to receive their increased benefits until June 3 1971 the regular date for the receipt of their May checks. It is expected that an additional check for the increased amounts for the months of January, February, March, and April will be mailed as a separate check at about this same time.

This bill differs from what many of us have been urging. It increases the monthly minimum benefit by only \$6.40, from \$64 to \$70.40. I had been urging an increase in monthly minimum benefits from \$64 to \$100.

Further, as I have pointed out, it provides for only a 10-percent increase in benefits as opposed to the 15-percent increase which many of us in Congress had been urging. However, it is nearly 70 percent more than the increase which the Nixon administration had proposed, and Mr. Nixon could not refrain from calling this measure inflationary when he signed it into law.

Another disappointment in this bill is that the final version did not contain the language which I had urged and which the Senate-passed version had contained, with respect to increases in the earnings limitation. As originally passed by the Senate, this bill would have increased the amount that a beneficiary could earn while retaining his eligibility to receive his benefits from the present \$1,680 a year to \$2,400.

Further, the Senate version contained a provision which would have reduced benefits by \$1 for each \$2 of all earnings above the exempt amount. This provision would have been a departure from present law which provides a \$1 for \$2 reduction only for the first \$1,200 above the exempt amount and a \$1 for \$1 reduction for all additional earnings.

Although this change in the earnings test was not included in the legislation which we enacted, I was happy to note that the conference report did indicate that when the social security legislation—H.R. 1—now pending before the House Committee on Ways and Means is reported, it will provide for some increase in the earnings limitation.

A significant feature of this bill is that it provides for a 5-percent increase in special benefits for certain people 72 years of age and over who did not work long enough in employment covered by social security to qualify for regular benefits. This would increase these benefits from \$46 to \$48.30 for a single person and from \$69 to \$72.50 for a couple. This increase, like the regular increase, is retroactive to January 1, 1971, but again, the increased amounts, according to the most recent information, will not be received until June.

The cost of these new benefits will be financed by an increase in the tax base from \$7,800 a year to \$9,000 per year, and an increase of 0.3 percent in the combined employer-employee tax rates beginning in 1976.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot stop here, and we cannot stop with the next passage of

social security benefit increases. According to a report of the Senate Select Committee on Aging, the number of aged poor rose by approximately 200,000 between 1968 and 1969, and continues to rise.

Today, one out of every four Americans 65 and over must live on a poverty-level income. As inflation continues to rise, even the program which I have been urging will not begin to abolish poverty among American senior citizens, but it will at least ease the financial burdens facing millions of elder Americans—especially those at the bottom of the benefit scale.

SCOUTS AND BIRDHOUSES

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, one of the major concerns of the American public today is the protection and preservation of the Nation's natural wildlife, and I am proud to call to the attention of my colleagues to the work done in this vital area by a group of Boy Scouts from my 20th Congressional District in Pennsylvania.

"Operation Bluebird" was a project launched by members of Boy Scout Troop 78. It consisted of the building and distribution of 230 birdhouses for bluebirds, wrens, and robins which inhabit a beautiful public park and model farm operated by the Allegheny County commissioners. This is not the first time these young men have accomplished such an undertaking. They did it last year and to date they have constructed and placed a total of 365 birdhouses throughout the park.

In addition, Troop 78 also has built and donated 85 birdhouses to other district camp sites and has planted several thousand seedlings at the location of a former strip mine. Because of these projects and others, it comes as no surprise to learn the troop is in contention for the national Scouting conservation award.

"Operation Bluebird" was conducted under the direction of the troop's scoutmaster, Mr. Evan Leggitt; the committee chairman, Mr. Andrew Mihalek; the assistant committee chairman, Mr. Jack Keefer; and Mr. Henry Foster. Members of Troop 78 were assisted in the distribution of the birdhouses by volunteers from a Cub Scout pack and two Girl Scout troops. Mr. Speaker, I commend these young men and women for their unselfish efforts, and I am proud to place their names in the Record where others might see them and follow their example.

Troop 78: Charles Andrews, Paul Andrews, Regis Andrews, Joseph Burgan, Daniel Christoff, Kenneth Dugan, Edward Fisher, Daniel C. Gioia, Vincent Gioia, Gary Greenawalt, James L. Harchelroad, Mark Hill, Louis A. Hopkin, Wendell Hopkin, Kevin Marchetti, Andrew Mihalic, Kevin Paffrath, Lawrence Ross, Terry L. Thompson, David Weeks, James Wilson, Jeff Greenawalt, Timothy W. Burgan, Leonard Nizinski, James Dugan, Patrick E. Buono, Martin Craighead, and Gregory Hunt.

Pack 78: Merrill Newmeyer, James Stewart, Allen Tognarine, Edward Fos-

ter, James Baxter, Joseph Gassner, James Werner, Allen Crisswell, Daniel Chomas, Joseph Chomas, Robert Koch, Michael Sabol, Edward Spaulding, Eric McNeil, Daniel Stonebreaker, Richard Bollas, Robert Chomas, Ronald Chomas, John Guffey, Robert Guffey, Lee Martin, Eric Newmeyer, Maxwell Wall, and Jay Keefer.

Girl Scouts: Karen Bollas, Jennifer Caird, Theresa Chomas, Cynthia Chomas, Nancy Baxter, Cathy Baxter, Joyce Criswell, Apryle Criswell, Ferne Criswell, and Tena Koch.

PLIGHT OF RURAL AMERICA

HON. ELIGIO de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I join with many of my colleagues in a continuing effort to focus attention to the plight of rural America.

By no means do we seek—nor is it our intention—to detract in any way from the problems of our city brethren. The fact is that in my estimation the problem is more acute in the rural areas, since it is the problem of the rural areas that has compounded the city problem.

As our brothers leave the farms and journey to the city with the hope of a better life—or at least more of an opportunity than they had in the rural areas for such—they overcrowd the cities, they overburden the governmental services and all the facilities.

Too many times people tend to apply a remedy to the local problem, not realizing that the actual cause of the problem is far away. And so we keep hearing pleas for increased expenditures for the cities, while the flow of people continues into the cities.

We must, emphatically we must attack the problem at its source.

Mr. Speaker, I know that many people have many ideas as to what causes the problem and there are, I am sure, as many answers. So what I say today is my personal opinion and my humble recommendations are again my personal views. I speak for no group nor for any person but myself.

Let us look for a while at our city brothers and compare their plight to that of rural America. Regardless of any other problem our city brothers have, they have available at least the basic facilities and, in most instances, laws on zoning or housing to assure the minimum services of water, lights, sewer, and gas or at least supplies of coal or fuel oil.

Such is not the case in rural America. We have a terrible problem even for these basic necessities. There are many settlements—some are called colonias in my area—that have no facilities at all for sewage disposal—and no reasonable expectation to secure any under the existing programs which are, in the major part, limited to cities and towns or at least incorporated areas.

The several Federal agencies dealing with this problem must meet. I urge strongly that they begin at least to look

at the possibility of adding this area of concern to the existing programs or recommending appropriate legislation for that purpose.

Again our city brothers have, for the greatest part, domestic water available for home consumption and laws making certain requirements for water purity, also Federal programs for grants and loans to provide these facilities. We of the rural areas have a very limited area of Federal participation and never enough money to even take care of those areas that want to participate.

It is a shame to have to tell you that we still have many of our citizens in my area who must drink water from irrigation ditches and canals. Many must carry water in tanks or barrels for miles to have any water in their homes.

This should not be so in this day and age. I again urge the respective agencies to at least take a look at this terrible problem, and I again strongly recommend the appropriate legislation be recommended to make available grants for this type service. I say this because the greater majority of these people are below the poverty level, and as much as they would like to help themselves, they are unable to do so.

They are not doing this by choice, they have no alternative. We cannot, we must not, allow this to continue. As we speak of priorities, the plight of these people should be uppermost in our plans.

Continuing these efforts, we now go to power and lights. There is no problem, I am sure, in any municipality. We do have the REA, providing a very excellent service to rural America, but we still have the problem that they do not have sufficient funds to provide the service everywhere that it is needed. As fine a service as the REA and the several public utility companies provide, we still have plenty of room for improvement.

And so the list continues, Mr. Speaker, reciting the problems of rural America and the areas in which they are deficient. Such areas are farther away from a doctor or a hospital, more often than not they do not have the necessary resources for either medical attention or medicine. Their children are farther away from the schools or other educational facilities. The same applies even to the few Federal programs available to them.

It becomes a problem of accessibility because of the concentrated location of these facilities in the cities.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention a most serious problem in the rural area—and this is employment.

I know that the Government cannot solve this problem, but it should help wherever possible. These, our rural brothers, in the much greater majority are decent, hard-working citizens. The much greater majority are devout Christian families. Their children are not, by and large, those who are frequently in trouble.

Rural America is the grassroots of our country and it is very unfortunate that this vast segment really is suffering a plight not of their own making. I know of no one who is poor by choice.

Now, my colleagues, I do not want you to get the impression that we have not been trying to correct these deficiencies, nor would I want you to get the idea that

these people have not tried to help themselves. Let me assure you neither is the case. The reason for this talk is to ask your help, to strongly recommend that the several agencies revise their programs, and if necessary, recommend corrective legislation.

This is to respectfully ask you my colleagues, to look to the plight of rural America and to let us join the problems of our city brothers in order that we might work together to make truly a better life for all Americans.

REPORT TO NINTH DISTRICT CONSTITUENTS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the first of two reports on rural development in the United States:

REPORT ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

Rural America is a region so large that if it were a separate country, it would rank in area as the world's ninth largest. At the same time, however, it is a region so low in income, it would rank as the world's sixth underdeveloped nation.

While the Nation's attention has been riveted to the problems of the cities, the economic stagnation of rural America has become more and more visible. It is seen in

empty stores, trash-filled lots, weathered and unrepainted schools, collapsed barns, boarded houses, unkept farms and eroded fields.

Because of years of neglect, there is now an urgency for action in rural America. If we do not act, the rural poor will continue to flood the central cities of America, coming without training and skills, without housing, but wanting employment. The end will be frustration and despair.

Most Americans simply don't understand, or realize, the depth and complexity of the problems of rural America. The list of reasons for these problems would seem almost endless, but among the major ones are:

POPULATION IMBALANCE

The Census Bureau reports that the proportion of the Nation's rural population fell to 26 percent in 1970, down 30 percent from 1960. In 1920, the Nation was divided roughly between rural and urban residents. But today, there are 150 million residents in urban America, and just over 50 million in rural areas. If the present trend continues, by the year 2000 we will have added another 100 million Americans and some 240 million will be crowded into urban areas occupying only 4 percent of our total land area.

DEPENDENCY RATIO

The exodus from rural America has been largely working-age people, who represent the area's best hope, and carry with them a considerable investment in education and training. The people left behind include a higher-than-average ratio of those under 18 and over 65 years of age. This non-working ratio often is 20 percent higher for rural counties than for urban counties.

The out-migration of productive, tax-paying residents erodes the tax base of rural communities and leaves behind a high proportion of residents who require a higher level of tax-supported assistance, such as education and old age care.

POLITICAL POWER

Rural depopulation is emerging as an important political concern at all levels of government. It has played a major role in political redistricting, and if the trend continues, it will pose a challenge to the county system of government.

In the Congress, the era of the farm bloc is gone—probably forever. As the Congress has become increasingly urbanized, Members from rural areas have an increasingly difficult time in gaining support for rural programs. Of the 435 Members of the House, only 31 have districts in which at least one-fourth of the constituency is involved directly in farming. Indiana, considered a farm state, does not have a single Congressman representing a district in which one-fourth of the residents are directly involved in farming.

LACK OF ATTENTION

The rural people have few spokesmen to bring the Nation's attention to their problems. Frequently, I am visited by the Urban Coalition, the Urban Institute or the Urban League, but there are no rural institutes, or rural league delegates to press for help for the small town residents.

COMPLEXITY

It is obvious that the problems of rural America cannot be solved with a single approach or a single program. Some argue for the growth center, believing that concentration of investment in rural areas will spread. Others say a single plant in a single town may be the most productive way to promote economic growth. And still others say the best solution is to improve community service, especially education and training, to provide the skills rural people need to migrate out successfully.

These approaches illustrate the complexity of the theory of rural development, let alone the practice.

SENATE—Thursday, April 15, 1971

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. DAVID H. GAMBRELL, a Senator from the State of Georgia.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, send forth Thy light and truth upon this body that we may pursue the right in things both great and small. May our might be the might of the spirit, our strength be in Thy law, our power be in the way of love. May only truth be uttered and may the quest for justice be the motivation of all Thy servants. Deliver us from all guile hypocrisy, resentment, and fear, that all who serve in the Government of this Nation may do those things which bring Thy peaceable kingdom on earth. May goodness and mercy be in us and follow us all our days that we may be worthy to dwell with Thee eternally.

We pray in the name of our Servant Lord. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., April 15, 1971.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. DAVID H. GAMBRELL, a Senator from the State of Georgia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
President pro tempore.

Mr. GAMBRELL thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 14, 1971, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR ALLEN ON MONDAY, APRIL 19, 1971

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN) be recognized for 15 minutes on Monday next, April 19, 1971, after disposition of the Journal and the recognition of the joint leaders.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REOPENING OF TRADE WITH THE CHINESE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the President of the United States has taken a commendable initiative in seeking to reopen trade with China in nonstrategic goods. It is the latest in a series of thoughtful steps by which the President has sought a progressive restoration of a degree of civility between the two countries.

The lifting of the embargo, properly interpreted, will permit companies to trade in nonstrategic goods without interference by the Federal Government. At the same time the United States will expedite visas for Chinese who wish to come to the United States for official, commercial, or cultural purposes. Cur-